Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2007

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the through consideration given the present

application. Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully

requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below

Allowable Subject Matter

It is respectfully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claim 6

and 9 as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Without conceding the

appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, claim 1 has been rewritten to include the

limitations of claim 6 and new claim 10 has been added which incorporates the limitations of

claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, all the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by

Kajihara (U.S Patent 6,697,053). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of the present amendment, Applicant has added the limitations of claim 6 to

claim 1. Since this rejection was not applied against claim 6, Applicant submits that claim 1 as

well as dependent claims 3-5 and 7-9 are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Kajihara. Claim 8

stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103 as being obvious over Kajihara in view of Eriksson et al.

(U.S. Patent 6,424,337). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner feels it would have been obvious to recognize an aperture that corresponds

to the optical coupling as an alternative to an aperture that corresponds to the optical guide part.

The Examiner further relies on Eriksson et al. to show arcuate shaped switches. Applicant

submits that even if these features are obvious, the claims remain allowable based on their

dependency from allowable independent claim 1.

6

KM/RFG/khm

Application No. 10/814,147 Amendment dated: June 15, 2007 Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2007

New claims

Applicant has added new claim 10, which is a combination of claims 1 and 9. As indicated by the Examiner, this claim is also allowable. Applicant has also submitted new claims 11-17 which correspond to claims 2-8, but which depend from claim 10. Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable as well.

7

Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2007

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all the claims are now allowable. Accordingly, an early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse, Reg. No. 27,295 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,β34

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Docket No.: 2019-0244PUS1

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

8

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant